

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION

NETLIST, INC.,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

MICRON TECHNOLOGY, INC.,  
MICRON SEMICONDUCTOR  
PRODUCTS, INC., AND MICRON  
TECHNOLOGY TEXAS LLC,

*Defendants.*

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Civil Action No. 2:22-CV-00203-JRG-RSP

**ORDER**

Before the Court is Defendant's Motion for Protective Order. **Dkt. No. 169.** After consideration, the Court finds that the indicated depositions<sup>1</sup> are not abusive or improper and the Motion is **DENIED**. *Seattle Times Co. v. Rhinehart*, 467 U.S. 20, 36, 104 S. Ct. 2199, 81 L. Ed. 2d 17 (1984); see *Harris v. Amoco Prod. Co.*, 768 F.2d 669, 684 (5th Cir. 1985) (The Court has broad discretion in determining whether to grant a motion for protective order because it is "in the best position to weigh fairly the competing needs and interests of parties affected by discovery."); see *Landry v. Air Line Pilots Ass'n Int'l*, 901 F.2d 404, 435 (5th Cir. 1990).

**SIGNED this 19th day of September, 2023.**

  
ROY S. PAYNE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> Defendant raised concerns regarding two non-party witnesses located at Micron Japan and Micron Germany. Plaintiff indicated that depositions regarding those employees were dropped, resolving the issue. See Dkt. No. 176 at 1 n.1.